



IOWAccess Advisory Council

IOWAccess Revolving Fund Project Application

Proposing agencies should complete and submit Parts I, II and III to request Planning approval, then complete and submit Parts IV and V to request Execution approval.

Part I - Project Information

Date:	January 7, 2009
Agency Name:	Iowa Child Advocacy Board/DIA
Project Name:	ICABonline: Modernizing Child Advocacy
Agency Manager:	Richard Moore
Agency Manager Phone Number / E-Mail:	Ext. 2-6392 / rmoore@dia.state.ia.us
Executive Sponsor (Agency Director or Designee):	Richard Moore
Initial Total for Planning:	\$ 120,780
Initial Total for Execution:	\$ 495,000
Initial Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$ 615,780
Project Timeline: (estimate start and end dates for project spending)	Planning Start Date: Planning End Date: Execution Start Date: Execution End Date: 08/01/2009
Revised Total for Planning and Execution:	\$
Revised Total for all Phases of Project, if Multi-Phased:	\$

Part II - Project Overview

A. Project Summary: Describe the nature and use of the proposed project, including what is to be accomplished, how it will be accomplished, and what the costs and benefits will be.

Response:

Objective 1: Provide potential and active ICAB volunteers and ICAB staff with web-based information and resources that increase their awareness of child advocacy issues and that facilitate their advocacy work activities and interactions with each other.

Objective 2: Provide for electronic sending and receiving of reports and other information, much of which are now being copied, packaged and sent through ground-based mail services to and from the state office, satellite offices and program volunteers; and extend e-access to ICAB case-level reports and other documents to DHS, Judicial Branch and others (that currently receive such through ground-based mail) according to their capacities and business rules.

Objective 3: Make more efficient use of ICAB state office IT staff now having to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues that could be accomplished remotely with an improved IT environment.

Objective 4: Establish an ICAB IT environment that allows for participation in future service oriented architecture initiatives and other multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system.

To prepare this proposal, an in-house assessment was conducted of ICAB's IT security, equipment and services; program operations and needs; currently occurring information exchanges with other agencies; and, state and federal requirements for ICAB's development and use of program-related databases. Consideration also was given to other state offices' IT and program planning initiatives to identify opportunities for improvements to procedures through which ICAB now submits and receives data and reports to and from them.

Judicial Branch IT and Court Improvement Project staff and DHS personnel would be consulted throughout the project to determine how their current and planned efforts could be assisted with new types of information from the enhanced capacities of ICAB's CASA program and Foster Care Registry databases. During the implementation of this project, longer-range multi-agency child welfare-related data coordination plans also would be developed.

B. Strategic Plan: How does the proposed project fit into the strategic plan of the requesting agency?

Response:

More effective targeting of ICAB resources to direct customer services is expected through reduced paperwork-handling duties of direct service staff. In SFY2006, over 3,700 children were served by ICAB programs that involve 20 local program coordinators and over 900 certified volunteers.

Longer-range expected benefits include improved child welfare system planning and monitoring through the availability of better information from ICAB programs and from multi-agency data coordination activities. It is hoped that increased efficiencies or improved case processing by the Courts and DHS will be possible through ICAB efforts to partner with them on child welfare data coordination efforts. Annually, many thousands of children and families experience the child welfare system and DHS, alone, annually invests over \$800,000,000 in services to children and families in Iowa.

ICAB program coordinators, volunteers and other interested parties will be consulted throughout the project to help make the ICAB IT enhancements responsive to their immediate and anticipated data and multi-agency data coordination needs.

C. Current Technology: Provide a summary of the technology used by the current system. How does the proposed project impact the agency's technological direction? Are programming elements consistent with a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA) approach? Are programming elements consistent with existing enterprise standards?

Response:

Each office utilizes Access databases, COMET for the CASA program and REGISTRY for the FCRB program. There are 23 offices and coordination of data has been an issue. Developing performance reports has been problematic. Information distribution to volunteers, courts and DHS has all been paper based. This project will enable ICAB to become paper-less.

D. Statutory or Other Requirements

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with a Federal law, rule, or order?

YES (If "Yes", cite the specific Federal law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Is this project or expenditure required by state law, rule or order?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific state law, rule or order, with a short explanation of how this project is impacted by it.)

Response:

Does this project or expenditure meet a health, safety or security requirement?

YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care. Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such child placements. Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB's ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations. Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

Is this project or expenditure necessary for compliance with an enterprise technology standard?

YES (If "YES", cite the specific standard.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

If the answer to these criteria is "no," the point value is zero (0). Depending upon how directly a qualifying project or expenditure may relate to a particular requirement (federal mandate, state mandate, health-safety-security issue, or compliance with an enterprise technology standard), or satisfies more than one requirement (e.g. it is mandated by state and federal law and fulfills a health and safety mandate), 1-15 points awarded.



E. Impact on Iowa's Citizens

1. Project Participants - List the project participants (i.e. single agency, multiple agencies, State government enterprise, citizens, associations, or businesses, other levels of government, etc.) and provide commentary concerning the nature of participant involvement. Be sure to specify who and how many **direct** users the system will impact. Also specify whether the system will be of use to other interested parties: who they may be, how many people are estimated, and how they will use the system.

Response:

This project would establish a more robust ICAB IT environment so it can provide more helpful information about its own programs and Iowa's foster care population to DHS, the Courts, the Governor, the General Assembly and others; and so it can help facilitate and participate in multi-agency efforts to enhance the coordination and usefulness of data systems with connections to Iowa's child welfare system. Another, perhaps farther-reaching return from the requested investment will be the improvements and better-informed case-level and system-wide decisions that can be made with an increase in the availability and usefulness of information about the processes and outcomes of Iowa's child welfare system – a system that involves hundreds of federal, state and local officials; thousands of children and families; and, hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

2. Service Improvements - Summarize the extent to which the project or expenditure improves service to Iowa citizens or within State government. Included would be such items as improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, providing enhanced services, improving work processes, etc.

Response:

Annually, over 5,000 written, multi-page reports are prepared, copied and mailed by ICAB to Court and DHS officials. A much larger number of documents are mailed from ICAB to volunteers to support their case-level work. Beginning during the implementation year of this project, these ground-mailings will begin being transitioned to electronic mailings. Succeeding years will continue this transitioning of how ICAB sends information internally and to others. The ICAB administrator will work with DHS and others to request and facilitate plans for their electronic submission of data to ICAB. As such plans are developed, originating data sources and database management procedures will be examined to identify opportunities for service oriented architecture-based data exchanges.

This project would reduce the need for ICAB staff to travel to satellite offices to collect data files and trouble-shoot workstation and database-related issues. Time saved would be redirected to quality assurance activities, development of IT-related staff training resources, database

management and data coordination assignments. Any satellite office staff time saved will be redirected to direct service improvement activities.

3. Citizen Impact – Summarize how the project leads to a more informed citizenry, facilitates accountability, and encourages participatory democracy. If this is an extension of another project, what has been the adoption rate of Iowa’s citizens or government employees with the preceding project?

Response:

One of the returns on the investment for this project is the ability of the enhanced ICAB IT environment to streamline office procedures related to the copying and packaging of hard copy reports and documents. Reducing staff time spent on such activities will allow staff to spend more time on case-level work; volunteer recruitment, training and oversight; and preparations of reports to the Court, DHS and other officials. The thousands of children affected by ICAB services will benefit.

4. Public Health and/or Safety – Explain requirements or impact on the health and safety of the public.

Response:

This project will result in a more secure ICAB IT environment to ensure compliance with state and federal confidentiality policies related to the child welfare and child abuse information collected and maintained by ICAB.

I.C. Section 237.17 requires ICAB to establish a registry of the placements of all children receiving foster care. Included in this law are requirements for DHS to provide ICAB with notices, case plans and case plan revisions regarding all such child placements. Current levels of compliance with this law are unsatisfactory. The current ICAB IT environment is not resourced to take advantage of current and emerging technology that could be used to solve this problem and, in turn, improve ICAB’s ability to comply with I.C. Section 237.18 requirements for the preparation of various reports, evaluations and recommendations. Implementing this project will establish an ICAB IT environment that is capable of new data coordination initiatives with DHS and the Courts designed to achieve compliance with these state laws.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- Minimally directly impacts Iowa citizens (0-5 points).
- Moderately directly impacts Iowa citizens (6-10 points).
- Significantly directly impacts Iowa citizens (11-15 points).



[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimally improves customer service (0-3 points).
- Moderately improves customer service (4-6 points).
- Significantly improves customer service (7-10 points).



F. Scope

Is this project the first part of a future, larger project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.) NO, it is a stand-alone project

Response:

Is this project a continuation of a previously begun project?

- YES (If "YES", explain.)

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- This is the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure or project / expenditure duration is one year (0-5 points)
- The project / expenditure is of a multi-year nature and each annual component produces a definable and stand-alone outcome, result or product (2-8 points).
- This is beyond the first year of a multi-year project / expenditure (6-10 points)



The last part of this criteria involves rating the extent to which a project or expenditure is at an advanced stage of Execution and termination of the project / expenditure would waste previously invested resources.

G. Source of Funds

On a fiscal year basis, how much of the total project cost (\$ amount and %) would be absorbed by your agency from non-Pooled Technology/IOWAccess funds? If desired, provide additional comment / response below.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)

- 0% (0 points)
- 1%-12% (1 point)
- 13%-25% (2 points)
- 25%-38% (3 points)
- 39%-50% (4 points)
- Over 50% (5 points)



Part III – Planning Proposal

Amount of Planning Funding Requested: \$

A. Process Reengineering

Provide a *pre-project or pre-expenditure* (before Execution) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens interact with the current system.

Response:

Provide a *post-project or post-expenditure* (after Execution) description of the impacted system or process. Be sure to include the procedures used to administer the impacted system or process and how citizens will interact with the proposed system. In particular, note if the project or expenditure makes use of information technology in reengineering traditional government processes.

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- Minimal use of information technology to reengineer government processes (0-3 points).
- Moderate use of information technology to reengineer government processes (4-6 points).
- Significant use of information technology to reengineer government processes (7-10).



B. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Planning phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, **projected end date**, planning, and database Planning. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

D. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet, # 5 below and the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, # IV E3, as necessary:

1. One Year Pre-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project Execution. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process prior to project Execution.

Describe One Year Pre-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Pre-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Pre-Project Cost:	\$

2. One Year Post-Project Cost - This section should be completed only if state government operations costs are expected to be reduced as a result of project Execution. **Quantify actual state government direct and indirect costs** (personnel, support, equipment, etc.) associated with the activity, system or process after project Execution.

Describe One Year Post-Project Cost:

Quantify One Year Post-Project Cost:

	State Total
FTE Cost(salary plus benefits):	\$
Support Cost (i.e. office supplies, telephone, pagers, travel, etc.):	\$
Other Cost (expense items other than FTEs & support costs, i.e. indirect costs if applicable, etc.):	\$
Total One Year Post-Project Cost:	\$

3. One Year Citizen Benefit - Quantify the estimated one year value of the project to Iowa citizens. This includes the "hard cost" value of avoiding expenses ("hidden taxes") related to conducting business with State government. These expenses may be of a personal or business nature. They could be related to transportation, the time expended on the manual processing of governmental paperwork such as licenses or applications, taking time off work, mailing, or other similar expenses. As a "rule of thumb," use a value of \$10 per hour for citizen time.

Describe savings justification:

<u>Transaction Savings</u>	
Number of annual online transactions:	9000
Hours saved/transaction:	5
Number of Citizens affected: [direct citizen volunteer users of the system]	1500
Value of Citizen Hour	\$10.00
Total Transaction Savings:	\$75,000.00
Other Savings (Describe)	\$
Total One Year Citizen Benefit :	\$75,000.00

4. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance - Quantify the estimated one year non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc

Response:

5. Planning Phase Cost Calculation

On a fiscal year basis, enter the **estimated** cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades, etc., during the **Planning Phase**.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

6. Planning Financial Benefit Worksheet

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	\$	
G. Planning Phase Cost Calculation (Section III D5):	\$	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =		
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100		

6.

Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable - List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Part IV – Execution Funding

Amount of Execution Funding Requested: \$250,000.00

Amount of Hosting Requested: \$0

Note: Projects developed by DAS-ITE allow first year of hosting charges

A. Timeline

Provide a projected timeline for the Execution phase of the project. Include such items as **start date**, coding, testing, deployment, conversion, parallel installation, and **projected date of final release**. Also include the parties responsible for each item.

Response:

Start Date: 01/05/2009

complete coding for first release: 04/03/2009

test releases: 03/02 – 06/01/2009

migrate data from local offices: 03/15 – 05/01/2009 – ITE and ICAB

validate migrated data: 05/01 – 06/30/2009

complete coding of reports: 07/15/2009

test reports: 06/15 – 07/30/2009

Projected date of final release: 08/07/2009

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The timeline contains several problem areas (0-3 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with few problem areas (4-6 points).
- The timeline seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



B. Execution Funding Requirements

On a fiscal year basis, enter the **estimated** cost by funding source: Be sure to include developmental costs and ongoing costs, such as those for hosting the site, maintenance, upgrades, etc., during the **Execution Phase**.

	Current FY		Current FY +1		Current FY +2	
	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost	Cost(\$)	% Total Cost
State General Fund	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Pooled Tech. Fund /IOWAccess Fund	\$245000	0%	\$250000	0%	\$0	0%
Federal Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Local Gov. Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Grant or Private Funds	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Other Funds (Specify)	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%
Total Project Cost	\$245000	0%	\$250000	0%	\$0	0%
Non-Pooled Tech./Non-IOWAccess Total	\$0	0%	\$0	0%	\$0	0%

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)

- The funding request contains questionable items (0-3 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with few questionable items (4-6 points).
- The funding request seems reasonable with no problem areas (7-10).



C. Project Budget Table

It is necessary to estimate and assign a useful life figure to each cost identified in the project budget. Useful life is the amount of time that project-related equipment, products, or services are utilized before they are updated or replaced. In general, the useful life of hardware is three (3) years and the useful life of software is four (4) years. Depending upon the nature of the expense, the useful life for other project costs will vary between one (1) and four (4) years. On an exception basis, the useful life of individual project elements or the project as a whole may exceed four (4) years.

The Total Annual Prorated Cost (State Share) will be calculated based on the following equation:

$$\left[\left(\frac{\text{Budget Amount}}{\text{Useful Life}} \right) \times \% \text{ State Share} \right] + (\text{Annual Ongoing Cost} \times \% \text{ State Share}) = \text{Annual Prorated Cost}$$

Budget Line Items	Budget Amount (1 st Year Cost)	Useful Life (Years)	% State Share	Annual Ongoing Cost (After 1 st Year)	% State Share	Annual Prorated Cost
Agency Staff	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Software	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Hardware	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Training	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Facilities	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Professional Services	\$		%	\$	%	\$
ITE Services	\$495000	10	100%	\$3500	100%	\$
Supplies, Maint., etc.	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Other	\$		%	\$	%	\$
Totals	\$		%	\$	%	\$

D. Spending plan

Explain how the funds will be allocated.

E. Tangible and/or Intangible Benefits

Respond to the following and transfer data to the Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet, #3 below, as necessary:

- 1. Opportunity Value/Risk or Loss Avoidance** – Quantify the estimated annual non-operations benefit to State government. This could include such items as qualifying for additional matching funds, avoiding the loss of matching funds, avoiding program penalties/sanctions or interest charges, avoiding risks to

health/security/safety, avoiding the consequences of not complying with State or Federal laws, providing enhanced services, avoiding the consequences of not complying with enterprise technology standards, etc.

Response:

2. Benefits Not Readily Quantifiable – List and summarize the overall non-quantifiable benefits (i.e., IT innovation, unique system application, utilization of new technology, hidden taxes, improving the quality of life, reducing the government hassle factor, meeting a strategic goal, etc.).

Response:

3. Execution Financial Benefit Worksheet – Copy items A through F from Part III (Planning Phase), Section III D6; item G is from Section IV C, above.

A. Total One Year Pre-Project cost (Section III D1):	\$101,000	
B. Total One Year Post-Project cost (Section III D2):	\$28,000	
C. State Government Benefit (= A-B):		\$73,000
D. One Year Citizen Benefit (Section III D3):		\$75,000
E. Opportunity Value or Risk/Loss Avoidance Benefit (Section III D4):		\$28,000
F. Total Planning Benefit (C+D+E)	\$176,000	
G. Annual Prorated Cost (From Budget Table, Section IV C):	\$53,000	
Benefit / Cost Ratio: (F/G) =	3.3	
Return On Investment (ROI): ((F-G) / Requested Project Funds) * 100	24.8	

[This section to be scored by application evaluator.]
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)

- The financial analysis contains several questionable entries and provides minimal financial benefit to citizens (0-5 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with few questionable entries and provides a moderate financial benefit to citizens (6-10 points).
- The financial analysis seems reasonable with no problem areas and provides maximum financial benefit to citizens (11-15).



Evaluation Summary

[This section to be completed by application evaluator.]

Planning Phase:

Requirements/Compliance Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Impact Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Customer Service Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scope Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Funds Evaluation (5 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reengineering Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Timeline Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Planning Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL PLANNING EVALUATION</u> (90 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Execution Phase:

Execution Timeline Evaluation (10Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Financial Evaluation (15 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Execution Funding Evaluation (10 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>TOTAL EXECUTION EVALUATION</u> (35 Points Maximum)	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part V – Auditable Outcome Measures

For each of the following categories, list the auditable metrics for success after Execution and identify how they will be measured.

1. Improved customer service

Response: satisfaction/usefulness of enhanced ICAB IT capacity as measured through surveys and interviews with volunteers, local office staff and other officials involved with Iowa's child welfare system

2. Citizen impact

Response: % child welfare cases receiving ICAB reviews and CASA services as measured through reports from DHS and ICAB data systems; % ICAB case recommendations accepted through DHS/Court case planning decisions as measured with reports generated from enhanced ICAB databases; % increase in volunteer applications processed

3. Cost Savings

Response: ICAB budget tracked by budget category to determine ongoing impact of enhanced IT environment on various ICAB business processes and operational expenses

4. Project reengineering

Response: specific project milestones (e.g. RFA's issued, bids accepted, equipment installed and databases migrated as scheduled, % reports available electronically, etc.) to be established and tracked upon project funding approval

5. Source of funds (Budget %)

Response: NA

6. Tangible/Intangible benefits

1. Response: % multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives implemented as planned as measured by ICAB documentation; impact measures of multi-agency child welfare system data coordination initiatives to be determined as initiatives are planned and agreed to by involved parties

